

Comment on the proposed designation of *Bithinia deschiensiana* Deshayes, 1862 and *Paludina desmarestii* Prévost, 1821 as the respective type species of *Euchilus* Sandberger, 1870 and *Stalioa* Brusina, 1870 (Mollusca, Gastropoda)
(Case 3008; see BZN 55: 82–86; 56: 187)

Dietrich Kadolsky

The Limes, 66 Heathhurst Road, Sanderstead, South Croydon, Surrey CR2 0BA, U.K.

Bouchet (BZN 56: 187, September 1999) asserts that 'contrary to the statement in para. 3 of the application, 'the majority of authors' have not accepted *Bithinia deschiensiana* Deshayes, 1862 as the type species of *Euchilus*' but instead have accepted *Paludina desmarestii* Prévost, 1821, and cites four works to support his view, although in the original publication six works were quoted in which *Bithinia deschiensiana* was stated to be the type species. These were Sandberger (1872), Clessin (1880), Cossmann (1888), Schlickum (1968), Kadolsky (1993) and Kabat & Hershler (1993). I can add three more to support Bouchet's assertion, i.e. Schlickum (1961, 1965) and Roman (1912), but the two works of Wenz (1926, 1939) are erroneously included here (see next para.). Thus five publications by four authors stated *Paludina desmarestii* to be the type species of *Euchilus*, compared with six papers by seven authors accepting *Bithinia deschiensiana*. Considering that Schlickum (1968) corrected his earlier (1961, 1965) view, these earlier two papers may be discounted. At any rate, these differing views illustrate that there is no state of nomenclatural stability which deserves to be preserved; instead, a decision to create stability is required. It is not argued here that majority usage alone should be decisive, but that the intention of the original publication and the consequences of any Commission decision should also be considered.

Wenz (1926, 1939) treated *Euchilus* Sandberger, 1870 as a synonym of *Stalioa* Brusina, 1870, but he did not state the type species of the former. As he included (1926) *Bithinia deschiensiana* Deshayes (incorrectly cited in the synonymy of '*Stalioa gregaria* Bronn, 1829'; see Kadolsky, 1993 for the nomenclature and identity of this nominal species) as well as *Paludina desmarestii* in the genus *Stalioa*, it is not clear which of the two he considered to be the type species of *Euchilus*. As Wenz was very familiar with Sandberger's work (1870–75), which he revised extensively in the *Fossilium Catalogus* (1923–1930) and before (for example, in Fischer & Wenz, 1912 and 1914), he would more likely than not have noted and, of course, accepted Sandberger's designation (1872, p. 225) of *Bithinia deschiensiana* as the type species of *Euchilus*.

Paludina desmarestii Prévost, 1821 is (unless the Commission intervenes as requested) the type species of *Euchilus* Sandberger only by accident, i.e. the advance publication (1870) of the combination '*Euchilus Desmarestii* Prév. sp.' in a plate legend appearing earlier than the text (1872) in which Sandberger stated *Bithinia deschiensiana* Deshayes to be the type species. All authors except myself (Kadolsky, 1993) appear to have overlooked that *Euchilus* is available from this plate legend, as the name is always dated as 1872 and reference, where made, is only made to the text of 1872. Authors may have believed that a new nominal taxon is not made available

by publication in a plate legend alone. Under the premise which these authors accepted, that the name *Euchilus* was only made available in the text, *Bithinia deschiensiana* Deshayes would become the type species by original designation and the subsequent designation of *Paludina desmarestii* Prévost would be plainly erroneous. None of the authors who believed the latter to be the type species of *Euchilus* gave any reasoning for this view, but an oversight is the most likely explanation.

The main reason for Sandberger to introduce the new genus *Euchilus* was the presence of a calcareous, concentrically structured operculum. This was described by Deshayes (1862) only for *Bithinia deschiensiana*. Sandberger merely assumed it to be present in the other species which he included in *Euchilus*. Thus, the intended type species is the only one which actually shows the principal diagnostic feature of the genus. (It may be doubtful whether this operculum does belong to *Bithinia deschiensiana*, but in this context only the intention of Sandberger is relevant).

No valid reason has been given by Bouchet to support his wish to secure the synonymy of *Stalioa* and *Euchilus* by making them objective synonyms, contrary to Sandberger's intention and contrary to subsequent usage by the majority of authors. If the two candidate type species of *Euchilus* were congeneric, *Euchilus* and *Stalioa* would become subjective synonyms, without the need for any action by the Commission; in this case I would prefer that *Stalioa* should have precedence over *Euchilus*, as the exact dates of publication within 1870 of both names are not known. However, I (Kadolsky, 1993) demonstrated that the relationship between *Paludina desmarestii* and *Bithinia deschiensiana* is very remote, and that no generic name other than *Euchilus* can be considered for use for a genus which includes *Bithinia deschiensiana*. I refrained from introducing a new name because of the existence of *Euchilus* Sandberger, 1870, expecting that the Commission would validate it with the originally intended type species. If *Paludina desmarestii* were to become the type species of *Euchilus*, a new generic name would have to be introduced for *Euchilus* sensu Kadolsky (1993), based on the current assessment of the taxonomy.

In the case of *Stoliva* Fuchs, 1877, I would agree that there is generally no need for the Commission to suppress erroneous spellings but it should be possible to make exceptions in order to avoid ambiguity and doubt. Fuchs twice spelt the name 'Stoliva', and suppression would remove the technical possibility of accepting this spelling as an intentional introduction of a new nominal genus.

In summary, the original proposals and their justification are maintained.

Additional references

- Fischer, K. & Wenz, W. 1912. Verzeichnis und Revision der tertiären Land-und Süßwasser-gastropoden des Mainzer Beckens. *Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geologie und Palaeontologie*, Beilagenband 34: 431–512.
- Fischer, K. & Wenz, W. 1914. Die Landschneckenkalke des Mainzer Beckens und ihre Fauna. *Jahrbuch des nassauischen Vereins für Naturkunde*, 67: 21–154.